Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC., Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 10-cv-03561-WHA (DMR)

ORDER RE NEW SUBMISSION

Re: Dkt. Nos. 1430, 1432

On January 14, 2016, the court held a hearing on Oracle's motion to compel discovery regarding Google's search distribution agreements. Docket No. 1404. At the conclusion of the hearing, the court ordered the parties to meet and confer and jointly submit a proposed order consistent with the court's guidance by January 19, 2016. Docket No. 1428.

The parties appear to have reached agreement about much of their dispute. Nevertheless, they submitted two competing proposed orders and two letters to the court. Docket Nos. 1430, 1431, 1432, 1433. By no later than January 20, 2016 at noon, the parties shall jointly file one proposed order containing the substance of their agreements, and leaving space for the following disputed issues to be decided by the court:

- 1. Oracle's new request for the estimated number of devices and other payments for each platform provider;
- The temporal scope of the Google's production; and
- 3. The deadline for Oracle to object to the information provided by Google.

The subject of the proposed order shall be limited to Google's search distribution agreements on non-Android, mobile platforms. See Oracle's Motion to Compel [Docket No. 1404] at 1-2 ("Oracle respectfully requests an order compelling Google to produce agreements regarding distribution of Google search services on mobile devices..."); January 14, 2016 Hearing

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 1434 Filed 01/19/16 Page 2 of 2

01119	OHIII		
Damp)101m101 01 () 0 110m10			

United States District Court

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1

2

Tr. 8:7-10 (Oracle counsel: "I would offer to limit it to agreements for the ... payments associated with the distribution of Google's search services on non-Android mobile platforms"); Tr. 23:5-10 (Oracle counsel limits request to agreements about "distribution of search"); Tr. 28: 22-25 (Oracle counsel explains that the requested information will show "the value that individual platforms can contribute to the distribution of search services").

Additionally, Google's motion to seal a portion of the January 14, 2016 hearing transcript is **denied.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 19, 2016

Donna M. Ryu United States Magistrate Judge